

Amendment to the Drawings

Applicant submits herewith a new set of drawings containing Figures 1 – 13. The drawings essentially correspond to those of the corresponding PCT application, with the exception of Figure 13 which illustrates the cover recited in Claim 34. It is submitted that no new matter is added by any of these drawings.

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action of May 27, 2010, has been carefully considered.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a).

The disclosure is objected to for containing various informalities.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 17 – 20, 22 – 28, and 30 – 31, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Fitzsimmons in view of the patent to Perkins.

Claims 28, 29, and 34, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Fitzsimmons in view of Perkins, and further in view of the patent to McClay.

In connection with the drawings, applicant has submitted a set of formal drawings for the application. Figures 1 – 12 are identical to the drawings of the priority document, while Figure 13 illustrates the cover on the boring head. It is submitted that no new matter is added by these drawings.

In connection with the objection to the drawings, applicant has cancelled Claims 28 and 29. The cover of Claim 34 has been shown in new Figure 13.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Applicant has also enclosed a copy of the specification in which page numbers have been provided.

Relative to Claim 21, applicant submits that this claim is enabled by the description in the specification to an extent sufficient to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant submits that a

person skilled in the art (i.e., an engineer) knows how an adjustment means which is arranged eccentrically to the axis of the boring head works and how it is arranged in the boring head.

If a person skilled in the art reads the paragraph beginning line 22 of page 3 of the specification, they would understand what an eccentrically-arranged adjustment is. The beginning of the paragraph describes the adjustment means to be arranged centrally, substantially concentrically to the axis of the boring head, whereas the second sentence in the paragraph describes an alternative in which the adjustment means is arranged eccentrically to the axis of the boring head. Those skilled in the art would clearly understand that this simply means that the adjustment means is not arranged concentrically to the axis of the boring head, but is rather offset from the axis.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is overcome and should be withdrawn.

For the same reasons, applicant that Claim 21 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Those skilled in the art would understand the scope and meaning of the “arranged eccentrically” limitation.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly-advantageous manner from the constructions disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, Fitzsimmons does teach the insertion of two cassettes with a common adjustment piece. There is, however, no teaching of a common adjustment of cutting inserts and guide elements, as in the presently-claimed invention. This is acknowledged by the Examiner. The Examiner cites Perkins as teaching this feature. Perkins, however, does not show a

simultaneous adjustment. Instead, the cutting inserts are adjusted by externally-accessible screws. The single, common feature is an obviously cylindrical, centrally-arranged stop (stem O). Stem O is not an adjustment means that can be exchanged, but is instead a pure stop. The adjustment or setting takes place via the screws K1 and K2.

Thus, a combination of Fitzsimmons and Perkins does not teach a single-adjustment means for adjusting and aligning both the guide element and the cutting insert, as in the presently-claimed invention. Fitzsimmons does not have a guide element, and Perkins does not teach any type of simultaneous adjustment of both a guide element and a cutting insert, as in the presently-claimed invention.

In view of these considerations, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 17 – 20, 22 – 28, 30 and 31, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to McClay has also been considered. This reference adds nothing to the teachings of the previously-discussed references so as to teach the presently-claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claims 28, 29, and 34, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Fees

No fees are believed to be due. However, if any fee is determined to be due, authorization is hereby given to charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2275. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), please treat this and any concurrent or future reply in this application that requires a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. The fee associated therewith is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: 

Klaus P. Stoffel, Reg. No. 31,668
(Attorney for Applicant)
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
Tel: (212) 661-8000

Certificate of EFS-Web Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by EFS-Web to the Commissioner for Patents on August 25, 2010.

By: 

Klaus P. Stoffel